

### **REMARKS**

These remarks and the accompanying amendments are responsive to the most recent Office Action dated October 5, 2004. A shortened statutory period for response expired on January 5, 2005. A petition and fee for a one month extension of time, extending the period for response until February 7, 2005, accompanies this response.

Claims 1-126 were pending at the time of the last examination, although Claims 16-36 and 67-126 were withdrawn from consideration due to a restriction requirement. The withdrawn claims are cancelled in this response. In addition, Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 14, 15, 37, 40-42, 45-49 and 52-55 are cancelled in the response. Accordingly, only Claims 3, 4, 7, 9-13, 38, 39, 43, 44, 50, 51 and 56-66 are pending for further consideration, and reconsideration of these claims is respectfully requested.

Section 5 of the Office Action rejects Claims 1-7, 10, 13, 37-40, 42-45, 58, 59, 65 and 66 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States patent number 5,603,082 issued to Hamabe (hereinafter referred to as "Hamabe"). The rejection is moot with respect to cancelled Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 37, 40, 42 and 45, but remains with respect to Claims 3, 4, 7, 10, 13, 38, 39, 43, 44, 58, 59, 65 and 66.

Claim 3 is amended herein to incorporate all of the elements of Claim 15, which previously depended directly on Claim 3. Section 6 of the Office Action indicates that Claim 15 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (in this case, the prior Claim 3), but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Claim 15 has been so rewritten, and is now presented in the form of amended Claim 3. Accordingly, Claim 3 is not anticipated by Hamabe. Claims 4, 38 and 43 depend from Claim 3, and are thus not anticipated by Hamabe for at least the same reasons that Claim 3 is not anticipated by Hamabe.

Claim 7 is amended herein to incorporate all of the elements of Claim 8, which previously depended directly on Claim 7. Section 6 of the Office Action indicates that Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (in this case, the prior Claim 7), but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Claim 8 has been so rewritten, and is now presented in the form of amended Claim 7. Accordingly, Claim 7 is not anticipated by Hamabe. Claims 39 and 44 depend from Claim 7, and are thus not anticipated by Hamabe for at least the same reasons that Claim 7 is not anticipated by Hamabe.

Claim 10 is amended herein to incorporate all of the elements of Claim 55, which previously depended directly on Claim 10. Section 6 of the Office Action indicates that Claim 55 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (in this case, the prior Claim 10), but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Claim 55 has been so rewritten, and is now presented in the form of amended Claim 10. Accordingly, Claim 10 is not anticipated by Hamabe. Claims 58 and 59 depend from Claim 10, and are thus not anticipated by Hamabe for at least the same reasons that Claim 10 is not anticipated by Hamabe.

Claim 13 is amended herein to incorporate all of the elements of Claim 14, which previously depended directly on Claim 13. Section 6 of the Office Action indicates that Claim 14 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (in this case, the prior Claim 13), but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Claim 14 has been so rewritten, and is now presented in the form of amended Claim 13. Accordingly, Claim 13 is not anticipated by Hamabe. Claims 65 and 66 depend from Claim 13, and are thus not anticipated by Hamabe for at least the same reasons that Claim 13 is not anticipated by Hamabe.

Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn and is respectfully requested.

Section 6 of the Office Action also indicated that Claim 11 is objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim (in this case, the prior Claim 10), but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening Claims. Claim 11 is amended herein to incorporate all of the elements of the prior Claim 10. Accordingly, Claim 11 is in allowable form, Claims 56 and 57 depend from Claim 11, and are thus not anticipated by Hamabe for at least the same reasons that Claim 11 is not anticipated by Hamabe.

As indicated in Section 7 of the Office Action, Claims 9, 12, 50, 51, and 60-64 are already allowed.

Accordingly, all of the pending claims are allowable over the cited art, and favorable action is respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 18<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



Adrian J. Lee  
Registration No. 42,785  
Attorney for Applicant  
Customer No. 022913